nation of female warriors, living in the north of Asia, about the river Thermodon, are said to have made several expeditions against the Greeks. On one occasion they invaded Attica, and were defeated by Theseus, who slew their queen, Hippolyta. It was thus with peculiar propriety that in the same building, the Stoa Poicile, the Athenians represented in one picture the battle of Theseus with the Amazons, the close of the siege of Troy, and the battle of Marathon; thus commemorating, in one great design, their mythical and historical victories. We find this subject, so congenial to the Greek mind, repeated in a variety of forms. Pictures of combats of Amazons adorned the temple of Theseus; and the same myth was represented on the shield of the statue of Minerva, and the base of the throne of Jupiter Olympius, the works of Phidias; on the frieze of the temple of Apollo Epicurius, at Phygalia; and on a number of Greek fictile vases, which have been preserved to us. Turning from Greece to Asia Minor, we find the battle with the Amazons, represented on a variety of monuments, which probably commemorate the victories of the Greeks gained in Asia Minor, at the siege of Troy, and on the occasion when the Amazons invaded Ephesus. They are peculiarly connected with Ionia. The city of Smyrna, in the first century of the Christian era, claimed them as its founders. At Ephesus they are said to have founded the temple of Diana. On the coins of these two cities, struck in imperial times, we find figures of Amazons, and their combats on the frieze of a temple at Magnesia, now in the Louvre. Descending from Ionia to Caria, we find fewer traces of this myth. As far as I know, there is no mention of their presence so far south, in any of their invasions of Asia Minor from the Black Sea; but on the coins of several cities in Caria, Plarasa, Nysa, Mylasa, Tripolis, we find the Amazonian battle-axe, or the figure of an Amazon, used as a type; and the myth of Jupiter Labrandæus, who is represented on the coins of Mausolus, and other kings of Caria, seems in some measure connected with that of the Amazons. He is represented with a bipennis, or battle-axe, [*Labra*, signifying, in the Lydian language, the handle,] which is said to have been taken by Hercules from the Amazon queen, Hippolyta, and given by him to Omphale. From her possession it passed into the hands of the Lydian kings, and finally was taken from the Lydians, in battle, by the Carians. Now I would not insist too much on this slender tradition; but I think that the worship of Jupiter Labrandæus, viewed in connection with the frequent recurrence of Amazonian symbols on the coins of Caria, indicates a certain familiarity with the whole myth in the mind of the nation, expressed, as all such familiar beliefs were among the Greeks, in the types of their coins; and if the myth was thus a national one, it would naturally be chosen as a fit subject for the Mausoleum of the great Carian monarch. I may further add, that the story of the Amazons may have had a real basis of truth. It is possible that this, the general tradition of Asia Minor, may have had its origin in the inroads of some Scythian people from the north; among whom, in singular contrast to the habits of the eastern nations, women like Tomyris, queen of the Massagetræ, may have had the right of reigning. This custom of female sovereignty we find in the provinces of Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria; and we may suppose it may be a real remnant of Scythian occupation, as the myth of the Amazons may be a figurative record of the same event.

The last point which I shall notice, in reference to this inquiry, is the structure of the Mausoleum itself. I would not presume, on this occasion, and before such an audience, to offer any plan for the restoration of this edifice. I will content myself with making a few remarks on the celebrated passage in Pliny. He states the length of this building to be, on the north and south sides, 63 feet; the two fronts being something less; the whole circumference 411 feet; the height of the lower part or πτερὸν 25 cubits. It was surrounded by thirty columns. Above the πτερὸν was a pyramid, also 25 cubits high, tapering to a point, like a *meta*, by twenty-four steps. On the top was a marble chariot. The whole height was 140 feet. In the memoir on the Mausoleum, by the Comte de Caylus, prefixed to his plan for its restoration, he states that he had collated the text with all the MSS. known at that time in Europe. The collation of a MS. of the tenth century, the Codex Bambergensis, has been recently published in Sillig's edition of Pliny, in which various readings, greatly to the amelioration of the text, have been discovered. In this passage, the number of feet given for the whole circuit of the building is 440, not 411 in that MS.; and it is suggested that this difference may be accounted for by supposing in the later copies a blunder of the scribe, who, having to write XL, omitted the lower limb of the L, making it 11. As it is considered by the best authorities that this circumference is not that of the base of the building, but of the exterior wall surrounding it, it is not probable that the main proportions are very materially affected by this change of numbers. There is, however, in Pliny's text, another passage where the MSS. are not all agreed, and which has been variously dealt with by interpreters. He states that the Mausoleum consisted of, first, the tomb itself, surrounded by columns, in height 25 cubits, or 37½ feet; secondly, a pyramid diminishing by 24 steps, like a meta, also 25 cubits high, and upon that a chariot; the whole being 140 feet; 12 feet being allowed for the height of the chariot. This, added to the fifty cubits, will only make 87 feet, leaving a difference of 53 feet between the sum and the parts. The restorers of the Mausoleum and the commentators on Pliny, finding this difficulty, have tried to explain it in various ways. Caylus, refusing to consider the twenty-four steps an integral part of the pyramid, and contained within its measurement, assigns a separate dimension to them, an interpretation certainly not warranted by the text. Choiseul-Gouffier adopts a reading found in a minority of the MSS., but not followed in the best printed texts, making the height 100 instead of 140 feet.

If we reject these modes of explanation as unsatisfactory, we must suppose the tomb to have been placed on a basement sufficiently high to enable us to distribute the fifty-three feet over and above Pliny's sum. The Mausoleum, surrounded by its columns and surmounted by its pyramid, may have been placed on this basement something after the plan of the tomb of Mylasa; and as in like manner, in the restoration made by Sir C. Fellowes, the tomb at Xanthus, peristyle, and surmounted by its pediments, is placed on a lofty substructure ornamented with friezes. However this may be, the restorations of the Mausoleum, hitherto proposed, seem hardly to do justice to the seventh wonder of the ancient world. In the poem "De Spectaculis," attributed to Martial, the words

"Aere nec vacuo pendentia Mausolea."

"The Mausolea, which hang in the void air," would suggest some curious beauty of structure, some masterpiece of design, such as would be natural at a time when mechanical skill was rapidly developing itself, until it attained to the daring and magnificent architecture of the age of Alexander the Great.

I cannot but express my hope that my friend, the Professor of Architecture in the Royal Academy, may, in his lectures in the ensuing spring, throw a new light upon the obscurities of Pliny's description, and produce a restoration of the Mausoleum far more consonant to the genius of Greek art than any that has ever yet been proposed. With regard to the Bodroum marbles, I have his authority for stating, that the measurements of the slabs do not afford any very remarkable coincidences with the imperfect scale of the Mausoleum, as given by Pliny. It is not indeed likely that this could be the case; for that author, giving us the dimension of sixty-three feet for the length of the two longest sides, leaves us to guess the length of the two shorter ones. I have now gone through the inquiry I proposed relative to these marbles. From the topography of Bodroum it appears that the fort does not occupy the site of the Mausoleum. From the style of the sculptures I have shewn that they are probably of the time of Artemisia. Their subject is a Carian myth; though, perhaps, with no peculiar fitness to be selected for the decoration of the sepulchre of a king of Caria. The description of the Mausoleum, in Pliny, is too general to enable us to adjust, very, exactly the measurements of this frieze to any of his dimensions. In default, then, of more direct evidence from the site where they were found; their dimensions considered architecturally; or the character of their sculpture and subject; we must be content with the positive declaration of Fontanus, that the fortress of the knights of Rhodes was built out of the ruins of the sepulchre of Mausolus; and upon the faith of this declaration we must consider that in these marbles we possess a fragment from one of the seven wonders of the ancient world.

We have received from Mr. Newton the following communication, which must be considered as a supplement to the above memoir:—

In drawing up the hasty sketch of a memoir on the Bodroum marbles, read by me at the Institute of British Architects on the 16th inst., I had not time to refer to the dissertation on this subject by Sainte Croix—*Mémoires de l' Institut, classe d' Histoire*, 2. p. 506. That learned author shews that the Mausoleum is noticed in ancient authors, from time to time, from the age of Lucian; and was still standing in the 12th century, in the time of Eustathius, the commentator on Homer—who states that it *was, and is, a marvel*. To the testimony of Fontanus, which I cited in my paper, he adds a more full and detailed account of the destruction of the Mausoleum by the Knights of Rhodes, as narrated by Claude Guichard, in his work on the *Funérailles et Manières diverses d'ensevelir*, printed at Lyons, 1581, lib. iii. 5, p. 379. In that most curious narrative we find it stated that, in 1522, when the Sultan was preparing to besiege Rhodes, the Grand Master sent some of the knights to repair the castle of St. Peter, at Halicarnassus. Looking about for materials, the knights found, in the middle of a level near the port, some steps of white marble. Making use of these in their repairs, and finding the stone good, they continued to excavate on this site. As they dug deeper, they found the base of the building enlarge; and, at the end of four or five days' excavation, they came to an opening like the mouth of a cave; entering which, they arrived at a great square room, surrounded with columns of marble, with their bases, capitals, architraves, friezes, and cornices, carved in half relief, representing combats and histories. The knights were at first struck with admiration at the beauty of this work; but, shortly after, broke and destroyed the whole of it,—using it as materials. Besides this hall, they found a door leading into another,—as it were the antichamber; where was a sepulchre of white marble, of marvellous beauty and brilliancy, with its base and its crest, which they had not time to examine; the trumpets having already sounded the retreat. On returning to the spot, next day, they found the tomb opened and rifled, and quantities of fragments of cloth of gold and spangles of gold strewn about,—probably the work of pirates in the night. "Thus," says Guichard, "this superb sepulchre, one of the seven wonders of the world, after having lasted 2,247 years, was discovered and destroyed by the Knights of Rhodes, to repair the castle of St. Peter."

He further states, that this account was communicated to him by Dalechamps, one of the most learned of his contemporaries, who had the narrative from the *Commandeur de la Tourette*, one of the knights, a native of Lyons, present on the occasion of the discovery. By Dalechamps, I conclude he means the well-known editor of Pliny.

Though there is always just ground for caution in the reception of stories so singular as that of Guichard, neither the source from which it is derived, nor the internal evidence of its details, appear at all such as to lead us to doubt the general correctness of the narrative.

One circumstance in the discovery presents a very curious coincidence. The sepulchre is described as being found *avec son vase et son tymbre*. I have translated the latter word crest, though it may rather mean the whole funeral panoply. In either case, it is worthy of remark, that we know, on the authority of Thucydides, that the Carians were in his day found buried with their armour; and the scholiast on the passage adds, that, being the inventors of shields and crests, in token of this, a *little shield* and *a crest* was always buried with a Carian warrior. The *tymbre* of Mausolus would be placed on his sepulchre in accordance with a Carian custom. The narrative of Guichard suggests many more remarks and inquiries than I have at present time to enter

To learn about OCR and PDF Compression go to our website